

## HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MAY 28, 2004

The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners met on Friday, May 28, 2004 at the Hamilton County Highway Department, 1700 S. 10th Street, Noblesville, Indiana. President Dillinger called the meeting to order at 7:37 a.m. and declared a quorum present of Commissioner Christine Altman, Commissioner Steven C. Dillinger and Commissioner Steven A. Holt.

### **Highway Business**

#### **2005 Budget:** [Tape 1, #10]

Mr. Brad Davis reviewed the 2005 Highway Department Budget. Even though the 2005 budgets are static, there are changes in the highway budget. Mr. Davis reviewed the comparison table of the 2004 and 2005 budgets. In 2004 there was \$1.8 million in the Cumulative Bridge Fund with approximately \$500,000 for bridge maintenance and the rest for two projects in 2004. The Cumulative Bridge Fund may be eliminated and replaced by the Cumulative Capital Fund. In 2004 that fund was at \$2.9 million all designated for bridges. Altman asked how much did we raise each year in Cumulative Bridge? Mr. Davis stated approximately \$500,000. Altman stated we have not really changed anything, just look at what is raised each year for the substitution of revenue. Mr. Davis stated in 2004 there was \$500,000 in bridge maintenance and it was not showing up anywhere in the 2005 budget documents. Mr. Davis spoke with the Auditor's office and he was informed that the \$500,000 would show up in Cumulative Capital, once the Cumulative Courthouse Fund is approved. If the fund is not approved, that \$500,000 will remain in the Cumulative Bridge Fund.

Ms. Robin Mills stated there is another issue, the Cumulative Courthouse Fund can only be used for maintenance of the Judicial Center and Historic Courthouse. Ms. Mills has spoken with Scott Warner, Buildings and Grounds, and he will have to have \$300,000 from somewhere for maintenance of the rest of the buildings. Altman stated we need to ask Mike Reuter if there are any other cumulative funds that we can establish, so Cumulative Courthouse is not building up \$500,000 that we are not going to use. Altman stated in 2005 we will be ok because the Prosecutor's expansion project will use that \$500,000, but she is worried about 2006. Holt asked if the Cumulative Bridge goes in to Cumulative Capital or Cumulative Courthouse? Altman stated it is being replaced by Cumulative Courthouse and the bridges will come out of Cumulative Capital, as they are in 2004. Holt asked where does the highway pick up the \$500,000? Ms. Mills stated hopefully in Cumulative Capital but we will have to address the issue of the Buildings and Grounds budget.

Holt asked if we are technically away from doing any bridge that does not involve federal funding in a municipality? Altman stated if we don't have the Cumulative Bridge Fund, yes. The obligation for bridges only arises if we have the Cumulative Bridge Fund. Holt stated, so effectively we could say to Noblesville, build your own Pleasant Street bridge? Altman stated anything, but major bridge. Holt stated that would be a major bridge. Mr. Davis stated if the Cumulative Bridge Fund disappears, what will our strategy be with the municipalities? Mr. Davis stated the highway department's thought is that they would still like to have oversight over bridges and just define the bridge. The issue was that a definition of a bridge was not in the Cumulative Bridge statute. Mr. Davis stated that was the reason we wanted to try to do away with the liability for all the small structures, pipes and anything somebody could construe as a bridge in the municipalities, but we were still going to be the entity responsible for bridges, bridges being defined as bridges over 20' by federal statute. That is the approach the highway department would like to go with. If we are the only county in the State not overseeing bridges, this would create some complications with the federal aid process, with the overall inspection and prioritization of all bridges in the county. Mr. Davis stated the highway department is concerned. Holt asked what happens around the State? Mr. Davis stated to his knowledge, county's are responsible for bridges. Allen County is responsible for anything over 60" in diameter. In the federal aid bridge program, they allocate four bridges in Hamilton County - if we have every municipality separate, they will not give four bridges to everybody. Holt asked if it would make sense to have an initiative of the Highway Engineer's State Association to get legislation to define bridges, so it is uniform throughout the state. Mr. Davis stated he has had a discussion with a representative from LTAP and they did not seem to want to get in to it. Discussion on bridges followed. Dillinger would like to send a letter to the entities letting them know we are considering eliminating the Cumulative Bridge Fund, however we would rather not do that if they would agree to what a bridge is and put that definition in an interlocal agreement and ordinance. Altman stated that gives them a short time line. We are now poised to act. They are not only agreeing to what a bridge is, they have to assume the responsibility for anything less than 20'. It has to be for our liability. Holt stated actually they have. Altman stated to get her vote we will have to have a written interlocal agreement. Holt stated he does not disagree, the municipalities are maintaining their culverts now. Mr. Davis stated everyone is going by the 20' bridge rule, there has not been a question about that, it has not been formalized. Mr. Knight stated he has done some research on the amount of bridges each entity has: Carmel-42, Noblesville-21, Fishers-15, Westfield-12, Cicero-1. Holt stated it is the culverts that is the dilemma. Dillinger asked when we do our bridge inspections, do they inspect culverts as well? Mr. Davis stated they inspect anything 20' or greater. Dillinger asked Mr. Davis to put together an outline of an interlocal agreement for Mike Howard and bring it to the next meeting.

Dillinger stated he has received a call regarding the bridge on 161st Street, which has been promised to be replaced. Mr. Knight stated that is a small structure on a road that Westfield has annexed or has an interlocal agreement on. Mr. Neal stated we attempted to get Westfield to ask the developer to assist with the replacement of that structure but Westfield refused to ask the developer to do anything. Mr. Knight stated Westfield tried to get Langston to do the entire bridge, but they were only developing on one side of the road and would not do it. Altman asked if Westfield has an impact fee? Mr. Knight stated he does not know.

### **2005 Projects**

#### **2005 Bridge Program:**

Mr. Davis presented information on the proposed projects for 2005. Dillinger asked if any of the bridges are timber bridge candidates? Mr. Knight stated Bridges #2, #8 and #9 all located in Sheridan. Altman stated she has concerns about the long-term with timber bridges. Budget for the 2005 proposed Bridge Program is \$3,000,000.

#### **Small Structure Program:**

Mr. Davis stated the budget for the proposed Small Structure Program is \$932,000. Altman asked what are the design standards on small structures? Are they replacements of existing structures? Mr. Davis stated most of these will be con-span structures replacing a small structure, there are no widening plans other than if we need to get two lanes across the structure instead of one lane. Altman requested on the bridges to look at the area and see with the population and traffic counts if we should consider putting a walkway, if we can afford it. Mr. Knight stated almost everything on this list is rural and would not be a good candidate for a walkway. Mr. Neal stated the only one would be the small structure on 104th Street.

Dillinger asked if Noblesville has discussed anything with the county regarding the structure on 166th by the shopping center? Mr. Neal stated no. Holt asked if it is a bridge? Mr. Neal stated yes. Mr. Knight stated it has never been programmed and he has been instructed to not program that bridge. There is the aspect that this may be a historic

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MAY 28, 2004

bridge. Dillinger stated this will be an issue at some time. Holt stated if we are in charge of bridges, we should find out what Noblesville’s plan is. Dillinger stated he would like to talk with Noblesville’s administration first.

Holt asked about the resurface on 146th Street and Prairie Baptist Road, is that something we need to do or will Noblesville be annexing it soon? Holt asked if there would be to ask Noblesville to reimburse us on the resurface? It is their project that will be tearing up the road. Altman asked if we have any authority over excessive commercial traffic? Dillinger stated we can always put load limits on roads. Altman stated should that not be an issue as developers go through? Dillinger stated everything we have talked about with Noblesville they have been up front and willing to work with us, we need to sit down with them and discuss these issues. Altman would like to give direction to the staff that sit in the TACT meetings to point out that construction is going to tear up the road and you are not taking it over and we have to do something from the county’s standpoint. Dillinger stated that is a good place to start. Holt asked what is a reasonable request? Mr. Davis stated typically it is to maintain it. Mr. Neal stated if the road is really bad, rather than have the developer wedge and level, binder and surface to give the road some strength before the developer comes thru or that is what he does after he has torn the road up. Holt asked if we should resurface Prairie Baptist in 2005 and tell Noblesville the next resurface is their’s or do we tell them 2005 is their’s? Dillinger stated it would seem reasonable for the county to resurface it in 2005 and tell them we brought it up to this standard and they must keep it at that standard. [#849] Holt motioned that unless they have a plan and we are unaware of it that the county offer to do an 2005 resurface and request that the road become the developer’s road for maintenance, with the alternative load limits. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**2005 Chip & Seal and Resurface Programs:**

Mr. Davis did not provide a list of the 2005 Chip and Seal program, noted in yellow on the map the Resurface program is noted in red. Mr. Neal stated there are still two opportunities for the program to change, in the Fall after the evaluations from this Summer and then first thing in the Spring to see how the roads weathered the Winter.

**2005 Equipment Replacements:**

Mr. Davis requested approval of the requested equipment replacements for 2005. Altman asked if there was anything 4-wheel drive that is being replaced? Mr. Davis stated there are two. Altman stated Emergency Management needs another truck to pull trailers. Altman motioned to approve the list of equipment replacements. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Utility Reimbursement Agreement:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of the City/County Utility Reimbursement Agreement, HCHD #M-04-0023 with Veolia Water Indianapolis, LLC for 106th Street and College. This agreement was previously approved on the county’s form and it needed to be on a State form. Holt motioned to execute the standard State form. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Utility Agreements Change:**

Mr. Neal reviewed the proposed wording change in the utility agreements. We are asking the utilities to let us know up front how long they will take.

Altman stated she and Judy Levine are going to Washington D.C. next week to request money. Altman verified that the county’s list of projects are 146th Street, Hazel Dell and the Riverwalk. Altman stated she will also be asking for money for the U.S. 31 corridor.

**LED Signals:**

Mr. Davis presented an analysis of the LED Signals. The change out to LED will save approximately \$7,000 in electrical usage and another \$2,900 in reduced maintenance. It cost \$58,000 to change out the signals. Our energy reduction is up to 75%.

Holt motioned to adjourn. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Present**

Christine Altman, Commissioner  
Steven C. Dillinger, Commissioner  
Steven A. Holt, Commissioner  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor  
Brad Davis, Highway Director  
Jim Neal, Highway Engineer  
Matt Knight, Highway Staff Engineer  
Kim Rauch, Administrative Assistant to Auditor

APPROVED  
HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor